



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

(Sess. 13).—"When a church, or the ecclesiastical ministry, be to be committed to any man, let such a person be found out for this purpose who can reside upon the place, and discharge the cure by himself; but, if it be done otherwise, then let him who has received lose that which he has taken contrary to the holy canons."

In after times, however, we know that the corrupt practice prevailed of a bishop wholly absenting himself from his see, enjoying, indeed, its revenues, and taking rank according to its dignity; but either wholly neglecting its duties or else discharging them by some hired substitute. It would be a pleasure, surely, at least, if we could find out who was the first to set an example of such neglect of duty, and if we could brand him with perpetual infamy. Full of these thoughts we took up, as our most trustworthy guide, Cardinal Baronius, the famous Roman Catholic ecclesiastical historian; and though, no doubt, there did not seem much use in looking at the early volumes, still, for fear of passing over the first delinquent, we thought it best to begin at the beginning. One of the first things that attracted our attention, as we glanced through the history of the first century, was the heading of the pages which were marked with the year of the Lord, the year of the emperor's reign, and also the year of the pontificate of the reigning Pope, St. Peter being the name of the Pope which first met our eye. On examining when his pontificate commenced we found that he is stated to have taken possession of the See of Rome A.D. 45, in the second year of the Emperor Claudius, resigning then the bishopric of Antioch, which he had held for seven years before. He is stated to have been Bishop of Rome for twenty-five years—a length of time which no succeeding Pope has equalled; so that it has become a customary address to a newly elected Pope, "Thou must not expect to see the years of Peter." When we read this, it struck us how much less strict the rules of the church were in the apostles' time than they became shortly afterwards; for it was reckoned, in the primitive ages, a discreditable thing for a bishop to migrate from one see to another, and more especially from a poorer to a richer. Several of the Fathers inveighed against the practice, as a kind of spiritual adultery (giving up a poorer wife for a richer); and the same practice has been condemned by several councils—Nice, Chalcedon, Antioch, Sardica, &c. Thus Pope Leo I. decreed (Ep. 84, c. 4).—"If any bishop, despising the meanness of his city, seeks for the administration of a more eminent place, and upon any occasion whatsoever transfers himself to a greater people, he shall not only be driven out of the see which is another's, but he shall also lose his own." Surely Pope Leo, and the other popes who made similar decrees, ought not to have been so severe, if they had only recollected how their own predecessor, St. Peter, had obtained the Bishopric of Rome by abandoning the See of Antioch, which he had formerly held. Doubtless, however, the apparent irregularity of this proceeding must be accounted for by the fact, that the discipline of the church was not so strictly maintained in the apostles' time as in the purer ages that succeeded them!

Let us, then, pass on from the question how St. Peter obtained the See of Rome, to examine how he administered it. And it is a curious fact, that though we read a good deal in Scripture both of St. Peter and the city of Rome after the year A.D. 45, we do not once read of the two being together. We read of St. Peter being at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 7) or at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), where St. Paul "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed." There is reason to think that he was in Corinth (1 Cor. i. 12) and (as St. Epiphanius also agrees) in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, to which places he directed his general epistle (1 Peter i. 1). Many are also of opinion that his general epistle was written from Babylon, in Assyria (1 Pet. v. 13); but there is no Scripture evidence that he ever was in Rome. Of course we do not, like some Protestants, bring forward these passages as proving that he never was in Rome, but only that he did not constantly reside there. Again, when we read of the city of Rome in the New Testament, we have good grounds for thinking that St. Peter was not there. St. Paul directed to the Church of Rome one of his longest epistles; but among the numerous salutations which he sends at the end to the Roman Christians, by name, there is not one mention of St. Peter; and, indeed, we can scarcely doubt but that, if the Roman Church had enjoyed at the time the benefit of an inspired apostle residing among them as their bishop, St. Paul would have directed his letter to some church that wanted it more. Again we are told (Acts xviii. 30) that St. Paul resided for two years at Rome; and we know that during that time he wrote several letters (e.g., Epistle to the Galatians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, the Colossians, to Philemon, and the second to Timothy); but though in these he sends several salutations from the Roman Christians, by name, to those whom he addressed, St. Peter's name does not once occur. In particular, St. Peter could not have been at Rome when St. Paul wrote (Col. iv. 11) respecting Tychicus, Onesimus, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus—"These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God which have been a comfort unto me." Or, again, when he wrote (2 Tim. iv. 11).—"Only Luke is with me." Or, again (2 Tim. iv. 10).—"At my

first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge."

We were happy to find that, in inferring from these passages that St. Peter was not constantly resident in Rome, we had the support of Cardinal Baronius, who also gives very satisfactory reasons for his absence; for it must be remembered that St. Peter was an Apostle, and, as such, "it was his duty not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, to bring those who did not yet believe to the faith, and thoroughly to establish believers." (Baron. Ann. lviii. sec. 51.) The Acts also contain full accounts of the earlier parts of St. Peter's apostleship; but in those days (Acts ix. 32) he is spoken of as passing through all quarters, and it is not likely that he got lazier as he got older. And we have in St. Paul a specimen of the work of an apostle. He says (Romans xv. 19), that from Jerusalem, round about to Illyricum, he had fully preached the Gospel of Christ; and even this did not satisfy him, for he designed (v. 24) going to Spain besides. Surely we cannot think that St. Peter was less active in doing apostles' work. Baronius gives us to understand that St. Peter left Rome at the commandment of the Emperor Claudius, that all Jews should depart from Rome; and, however strange it may seem that a Christian bishop, noted for courage, should abandon his see at the command of a heathen ruler, there can be no doubt that St. Peter was well employed when he was away. Baronius enumerates (p. 537) the names of a variety of churches which claim to have been planted by St. Peter or his disciples—Mauritania, Numidia, Britain, all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the adjacent islands. "How," says he on another occasion (An. xxxix. p. 272), "could he who had the care, not of one city only, but of all Christendom, who was bound to provide for all, to visit all, if he could, to instruct, to admonish all—in short, to feed the whole flock intrusted to him—how could he (and especially in times when the Christian faith was everywhere assailed, both by Jews and Gentiles)—how could he be confined within the limits of one city, however dignified, and not rather (as St. Luke testifies he did) go round and visit all the churches?"

Nothing can be more satisfactory than this. The cardinal has clearly proved that St. Peter's duty, as an apostle, made it impossible for him to confine himself to a residence at Rome. But, then, a perplexity remains. Why did St. Peter undertake the office of Bishop of Rome when he must have known that his higher engagements, as apostle, must prevent him from discharging the duty of bishop to a particular church? For St. Paul, we know, who says he had the care of all the churches, never fettered himself by undertaking the lower office of bishop of a particular see. What could have induced St. Peter to act differently? It could not have been because the office of Bishop of Rome was the highest place in the church, because every one agrees that the See of Rome had not this dignity before St. Peter became its bishop; nor could it be the title of bishop of the metropolis, for St. Peter, who had the title of apostle, needed not to covet any other; and we know that in his epistles he never calls himself Bishop of Rome. And, surely, we cannot think that his inducement was money, and that he took possession of the revenues of the richest see, paying a curate for doing his duty; for it is remarkable that some early authorities speak of Linus or Clement as Bishop of Rome at the very time that Baronius represents St. Peter to have filled that see.

Altogether we closed the volume in very disagreeable perplexity. There was no use in searching through its pages for any later examples of absentee bishops, if any of those who, in after ages, neglected their sees, could plead with truth that St. Peter had set them the pernicious example.

But when we reflected on the matter, we said, No, the thing is impossible. We must have been imposed on. St. Peter must have been calumniated. He never could have undertaken an office the duties of which he did not mean to fulfil. And he never could have thought that a bishop could discharge his duties without residing among his people. No doubt, if he ever was at Rome (or wherever he was), apostolic authority must have superseded episcopal, and the advice of the inspired apostle must have been implicitly followed in the government of the church. But knowing, as he did, that his apostolic commission required him to travel about constantly, he could never have accepted an inferior office, the duties of which required him to remain constantly in the same place. And the story of his having been Bishop of Rome must have originated in the emulation which existed among the ancient churches, all of whom were anxious to head their list of bishops with the most venerable name they could find. And, after all, there is as ancient authority to connect the name of St. Paul as that of St. Peter with the appointment of the first Bishop of Rome.

There is, however, one serious objection to our settling the question in this way. St. Peter's having been Bishop of Rome is one of several things which must be proved before we can establish the Pope's supremacy and infallibility. And if it should appear that St. Peter

was not Bishop of Rome, down will come the whole theory of the Pope's supremacy, just like a house of cards when you pull the bottom cards away. Can any of our Roman Catholic readers tell us how we are to avoid this very disagreeable consequence?

#### WHERE IS IT?—A COLLOQUY.

An inquirer after truth was lately discussing theology with a reverend convert from the Protestant faith to the Church of Rome. Transubstantiation, Purgatory, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Invocation of Saints, and the worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary formed, of course, subjects of great interest in the discussion; but it is not our present object to repeat what was said on either side on any of those interesting subjects; and we shall take up the discussion at the point on which the reverend convert to the Church of Rome ultimately was induced to take his stand, in acknowledging that he had not become convinced of any of the peculiar tenets of Rome by reasoning or reading upon them, but took them all on trust, as matters resolved and settled by the infallibility of the church whose tenets they are.

*Inquirer.*—But, reverend sir, assuming, for the sake of argument, that it were possible for me to lay all my doubts and difficulties at the foot of infallibility, as you seem to have done, will you come to the practical point, and tell me *where it exists*, that I may find it and avail myself of it? There may be a physician able to heal my sickness of the body, but if I know not where to find him his skill will remain useless to me, and my sickness remain unhealed; and, in the same way, supposing that this infallible tribunal exists *somewhere*, for the solution of my doubts, it will remain utterly useless unless I know where to find it, in order to avail myself of it and cast my difficulties at its feet. Where is it?

*Father M.*—It is in the church, speaking by its infallible head—the Pope.

*Inquirer.*—How am I to be assured of that? I have always heard it is said to be *somewhere* in the church; but I know that much difference exists among theologians in the Church of Rome as to the precise *somewhere*. One class of them is said to hold that infallibility resides in the popes; a second class that it resides in the councils; and a third class asserts that it is not in either of them separately, or in both conjointly, but that it resides diffused through the church generally. These several classes of theologians always seem to argue very ably in proving that their adversaries are wrong, but to reason very weakly and defectively when endeavouring to establish their own views; and I, therefore, am anxious to learn which of those systems you have founded your belief on as the true one.

*Father M.*—The French divines formerly held that infallibility resided in general councils and not in the popes; the Italian divines hold that it resides in the popes and not in councils; there seems to be a leaning now everywhere in favour of the popes; and, for my own part, I hold it to be in the popes.

*Inquirer.*—It seems a strange thing that if there be a *certainly* infallible tribunal, there should be any *uncertainty* as to where it is, or in what it consists. If your doctrine of the Pope's infallibility be the true one, it was, of course, always true of every true Pope since the days of St. Peter, and one would think would have been universally acknowledged in all ages. What say you to the Council of Basle, which was composed of a crowd of bishops and clergy, who came together from all parts of Europe, and yet decreed, in its 33rd session, that "none of the faithful did ever doubt of this truth—that the Pope, in things belonging to faith, was subject to the judgment of the same general councils." And in session 38, "that the council has an authority immediately from Christ, which the Pope is bound to obey." Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (who was afterwards a Pope himself, Pius II.), advocated that opinion in that council, in many learned and eloquent speeches, and sarcastically but acutely attributed the numbers on the Pope's side to this good reason—"that the Pope disposes of benefices, but the councils give none."

*Father M.*—You forget that the Council of Basle was opposed by the Pope, Eugenius IV., and that, when Æneas Sylvius became Pope himself, he changed his opinion, and published a Bull of retraction, declaring that as Æneas Sylvius he was a damnable heretic, but as Pius II. he was an orthodox pontiff!

*Inquirer.*—I am not ignorant of those singular facts; but you must allow me to say, that a matter so stiffly contested among themselves by Roman Catholic divines gains but little strength from either of them. That popes should ambitiously contend for superiority is natural enough, though some of them have disclaimed the title of Universal Bishop, if they are not misrepresented. But I cannot consent to take any Pope's word for his own infallibility, as that is the very matter to be proved.

*Father M.*—Whatever differences may have existed in the church, there is, nevertheless, very high authority in favour of the Pope—Baronius, Bellarmine, Albertus Pighius, Hosius, Canus, Aquinas, Cajetan, Pallavicini,

\* Nec unquam aliquis peritiorum dubitavit summum Pontificem, in his quæ ad eum concernunt iudicio eorumdem conciliorum universali a se subiectum.—Cone. Basil. decret. p. 117. Concilium habet potestatem immediate à Christo, cui Papa obediens tenetur.—Cone. Bas. sess. 38, p. 103.

Alphonsus Liguori, and many others, are all of that opinion.

*Inquirer.*—But are not Alphonsus de Castro, Lano, Gerson, Laurentius Valla, Tostatus, Du Pin, Bossuet, Erasmus, and many others of the contrary? I am, therefore, at a loss to know how such a matter can be considered settled by authority; and I apprehend the Council of Trent itself, with the Pope at its head, was unable to solve the enigma, and ultimately separated without any canon concerning it, though the discussion upon it lasted for several months, and a variety of proposed canons, relating to the Pope's supremacy, were drawn up, showing that the sole cause of their silence was the impossibility of coming to a common understanding upon it. In the absence, therefore, of an authoritative decision on this important point, on such a great occasion, where obviously the Pope, bishops, and legates would have decreed it, and were anxious to do so if they could have come to any agreement about it, an inquirer is driven to form an opinion for himself on the matter; and I confess the most plausible opinion, as to the seat of infallibility, supposing an infallible tribunal to exist, at times seems to me to be, that it rests on the decrees of general councils, when ratified and confirmed by the Pope: and if I can venture to judge from what I have heard from some educated men of your profession, few discreet Roman Catholics recognise either Popes or councils alone as incapable of error, and attribute infallibility only to both united—that is, to decrees of councils ratified by the Pope.\*

*Father M.*—I think your informers are scarcely aware of the difficulties into which such a doctrine would lead them. Supposing, for a moment, that both councils and popes have been wrong in each claiming independence and superiority over the other, and that the theory of your discreet (Roman) Catholics is the true one—that it is only the decrees of general councils, when confirmed by the Pope, that are really infallible—how do they get over such difficulties as the following—If the Pope's confirmation be necessary to the validity of a decree of a general council, must it not be asserted that it is the Pope and not the council that is guided by the Holy Spirit? Yet Catholics have always affirmed that general councils, lawfully called, have an infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit in framing their decrees. If they have not, what are they but the opinions of fallible men, like that of the majority of any other deliberative body? If it be, however, admitted that the Holy Spirit assists and guides the Council, how is it possible that the Pope can differ from its decrees? Can the Pope disannul what the Holy Spirit approves? Or can the Holy Spirit guide the Pope to reject the same thing which he has led the Council to receive and decree? If the Holy Ghost assists and guides both Pope and Council, the Pope must ratify what the Council has decreed, or the Holy Spirit must contradict himself, which is impossible. It seems, therefore, plain that the ratification of the Pope cannot be a mere condition; it is everything, or it is a mere form. It is, no doubt, true that the Council of Basle decided that they were above the Pope, and that they actually deposed Pope Eugenius, in 1439, who would not admit or confirm their decrees. You ask which was right, the Council or the Pope? In my opinion the Pope was right; and that Council could not have had the assistance and guidance of the Holy Spirit; for, if so, how would it be possible to believe that the subsequent refusal of the Pope to confirm the decree should deprive the council, *ex post facto*, of the guidance and assistance of the Spirit which had guided them to make it? It seems, therefore, plain that this mixed theory is not the correct one, and it was such difficulties as this, no doubt, that led such eminent controversialists as Cardinal Bellarmine to the conclusion—"Infallibility does not come partly from the Pope and partly from the council, but wholly from the Pope."†

*Inquirer.*—You seem, however, to forget that it is "the church," in its aggregate capacity, that God has promised to be with to the end of the world, not with any particular portion of it alone. And that God did not treat the Pope as "the church," is, I think, self-evident to any one conversant with the history of the Popes. Dr. Milner, in his "End of Religious Controversy," admits enough to convince any one who will venture to use his reason at all in matters of religion, that God has not always been with the Popes, and that some of them were but sorry representatives of Christ upon earth. "I, as well as Baronius, Bellarmine, and other Catholic writers," says Dr. Milner, "have unequivocally admit-

ted that some few of our pontiffs have disgraced themselves by their crimes, and given just cause of scandal to Christendom, but the credit of our cause is not affected by the personal conduct of particular pastors." This may be true within certain limits; but it at least shows that God has not been always with the Popes, and, therefore, that the Popes, unassisted by councils at least, cannot safely be trusted by Roman Catholics as infallible. General councils, as solemn assemblies of the bishops of the church, may, with more plausibility, be supposed to represent the church in its aggregate capacity, and, as such, to be under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and therefore infallible, as guided by that Spirit into all truth. No doubt there is difficulty in that theory (as you say), and popes have never admitted the supremacy of councils, but have often claimed it to themselves as their own prerogative, as vicars of Christ upon earth; but there have been often, as every reader of history knows, rival "vicars," who excommunicated and anathematized each other without mercy, and whose claims it would be difficult, or impossible, for the most impartial historian to decide between even now, much less when the heat of party feeling and conflicting interests were roused and in full force. Truth and piety do not seem to have been affixed to the chair of Rome more than to any other; and that the Papal State has not been exempt from the ordinary causes of error and impiety—ambition, avarice, and luxury—many ages have testified and complained. And in such times, at least, how is it possible to believe that the Pope was the sole, infallible guide?

*Father M.*—It was never held that the Pope was in all things infallible, and some of them may have erred, both in faith and virtue; but still Christ has promised never to desert his church; and I think there is less difficulty in admitting the Pope to be infallible than in believing councils to be so, or deciding between contending popes and councils, both of whom cannot be right, when they differ. Were I to go into the Scriptural argument, to prove the primacy of St. Peter and his successors, I think you would admit that the weight of argument is all on the side of the Pope.

*Inquirer.*—I should be very glad to hear you on those points when you are at leisure; though I am not ignorant of what has been said by learned writers on these subjects; and I even confess that it sometimes appears to me that if I could believe that infallibility exists anywhere, but in the Holy Scriptures (which are infallible, because inspired of God), the preponderance of argument between the three parties is in favour of the Papacy. Most of these arguments seem to be derived from something connected with St. Peter, derived from some word spoken to him, or some promise made to him, or some supremacy supposed to be in him; and, therefore, seem to point to something in the popes, as succeeding him, rather than to anything in councils.

*Father M.*—I am very glad to find an inquirer of your earnest views disposed to agree with me on this point; it is one on which the order to which I belong—the Society of Jesus—holds very decided opinions.

*Inquirer.*—But supposing that this matter was settled, and all difficulty removed from my mind on the point—which I am far from saying is the case—it appears to me that a further difficulty immediately arises—namely, how is it to be ascertained when the Pope delivers himself infallibly? It is admitted by all parties that some popes have erred, that some were even heretical,\* and that even, in the case of orthodox popes, they sometimes speak fallibly and sometimes infallibly. There are many Papal Bulls directly opposite and contradictory to other Papal Bulls. The difficulty, then, is, what is the test to distinguish between the fallible Bulls and the infallible Bulls?

*Father M.*—Nothing can be easier. When the Pope utters his decision *ex cathedra*, there is no doubt of the infallibility of the decision.

*Inquirer.*—I am aware that the Pope is said, by theologians of your school, to be infallible whenever he utters a decision or issues a Bull *ex cathedra*; but still it is necessary to learn how we are to ascertain a decision *ex cathedra* from a decision *not ex cathedra*.

*Father M.*—Nothing can be easier. There are certain essential requisites characteristic of a Bull *ex cathedra*, and without which it cannot be received as *ex cathedra*. They are seven in number; and but that I fear to weary you by the detail, I should be happy to enter into them.

*Inquirer.*—I feel deeply interested in so important a matter; pray do me the favour of detailing them, without any apprehension that they will weary me.

*Father M.*—Well, then, the first thing necessary is, that, before composing and issuing the Bull, the Pope should have opened a communication with the bishops of the universal church; that in such communication he should ask their prayers to the Almighty, that the Holy Spirit might fully and infallibly guide him, so as to make his decision the decision of inspiration. Secondly, it is necessary that, before issuing such Bull, the Pope should carefully seek all possible and desirable informa-

tion touching the special matter which is under consideration, and which is to be the subject of his decision. He should be specially careful to possess himself of all available information from those persons who are residing in the district affected by the opinion called in question, and who are found faithful therein; so that the Pope may have all the requisite information for an infallible decision from the very district in which the opinion, on which the decision is sought, had its origin or existence. The third requisite or essential is, that the Bull should not only be formal, but authoritative, and should claim to be authoritative; it should not be issued merely as the opinion or judgment of the Pope, in his personal capacity, but as the decisive and authoritative judgment of one who was the head of that church which is the mother and mistress of all churches, to whom all Christendom owe subjection and allegiance, and who is the living voice of infallibility, and who, as such, has the power and authority to pronounce infallibly the decision required.

*Inquirer.*—My dear sir, you are assuming rather more than I am prepared to grant without proof, when you assert so dogmatically so many things about the Church of Rome; but I wish to hear the remainder of your seven requisites or essentials, so pray be good enough to go on.

*Father M.*—The fourth is, that the Bull should be promulgated universally—that is, that it should be addressed to all the bishops of the universal church, in order that, through them, its decisions might be determined and made known to all the members or subjects of the whole church. The Pope is the fountain head of all episcopal jurisdiction, so that there can be no episcopal jurisdiction but from the Pope; and as episcopacy is the only channel through which every grace flows to the church, so it is necessary that the Bull containing the decision of the Pope be addressed to all the bishops of the universal church.

*Inquirer.*—You will not suppose me to admit that the Pope is the fountain of all episcopal jurisdiction; and I apprehend it would be easy to show, from the proceedings of the Council of Trent, that no such tenet was admitted in that council; but I postpone giving you my ideas upon that matter, and I pray you to go on with your remaining requisites.

*Father M.*—The fifth requisite is, that the Bull should be universally received—that is, that it should be accepted by all the bishops of the whole church as an authoritative and infallible decision—that, after promulgation by the Pope, it should be accepted and promulgated by all the bishops as authoritative and infallible, or at least should be simply accepted by them without formal promulgation, or tacitly permitted by them without opposition, which is held to be a sufficient acceptance in a legal sense.

*Inquirer.*—It appears to me, that your first, second, and fifth requisites are matters very difficult to be ascertained. How am I to inform myself whether the Pope opened a previous communication with the bishops to obtain their prayers, or whether he sought and obtained all the required information before he proceeded to issue the Bull, according to your first and second requisites? The fifth seems equally difficult to be ascertained. Indeed, I scarcely know anything more difficult to ascertain with satisfaction than whether any given Bull was received and promulgated, or simply received without promulgation, or only permitted without opposition in any given country. Some are received in Spain, and are rejected in France—and some are received in France which are rejected in England and Ireland—and some are rejected in all these, and yet are said to be accepted in Italy; and the assertions made on all sides upon this fact are so contradictory that I know nothing so difficult to be determined satisfactorily. This 5th requisite opens a prodigious sphere of inquiry and dispute. However, pray complete your remaining particulars.

*Father M.*—The sixth is one of immense importance, more absolutely essential than any I have yet named. It is this—The matter in question, to be the subject matter of the Bull, must be one touching faith or morals—that is, it must concern the purity of faith or the morality of actions.

*Inquirer.*—That seems very reasonable; but I apprehend that the Church of Rome has strained "faith and morality" to include all matters of fact, even matters of history, wherever they seem to bear upon any question of "faith" or "morality." Witness the celebrated controversy between the Jesuits and the Jansenists, where the point at issue was the matter of fact, whether the opinions condemned by both parties were really contained in Bishop Jansen's book "Augustinus," which Pope Alexander VII. declared they were in a Bull, dated 1657, though the Jansenists denied that they were so in-point of fact, and no one but the Jesuits could ever find them there. Pray, however, pardon this interruption, and, as our time is nearly exhausted, proceed with your seventh requisite.

*Father M.*—The seventh and last condition is, that the Pope should be free from all exterior influences, so as to be under no exterior compulsion or constraint. The Bull of Pope Liberius avowed Arianism; Pope Honorius was a Monothelite;

\* The late learned Charles Butler, the eminent Roman Catholic lawyer, in his book of the Roman Catholic Church (Letter x., p. 122, edition 1825), says—"In spiritual concerns the Transalpine opinions ascribe to the Pope a superiority and controlling power over the whole church, should she chance to oppose his decrees, and, consequently, over a general council, his representative. They likewise ascribe to the Pope the extraordinary prerogative of personal infallibility, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith—the Cisalpine affirm that in spirituals the Pope is subject, in doctrine and discipline, to the church, or to a general council representing her. They affirm that a general council may without, and even against the Pope's consent, reform the church. They deny his personal infallibility, and hold that he may be deposed by the church, in a general council, for heresy and schism."

† Tota firmitas conciliorum legitimorum est a Pontifice, non partim a Pontifice partim a concilio.—De Pontifice, Art. 4, c. 3.

\* Pope Liberius avowed Arianism; Pope Honorius was a Monothelite.

puleon, under a fear of his life, and, therefore, as he was not free, his decision could not be regarded as *ex cathedra*. The Bull thus issued was full of error.

*Inquirer.*—This is another point which may be, to one at a distance from Rome, very difficult of ascertaining. How am I, or any one in England, to ascertain, with anything like moral certainty, whether the Pope, at the issuing of any Bull, was really under exterior influences, or perfectly free, even if it was issued at the present day? But the difficulty must be enhanced a thousand-fold when the inquiry concerns some Bull issued centuries ago. I am afraid your tests are scarcely available for practical use, and I entreat you to tell me how to get over so many uncertainties.

*Father M.*—My dear sir, nothing can be easier; you have only, in such cases, to go to the bishop, and ask him whether the bull was *ex cathedra* or otherwise.

*Inquirer.*—Oh! I see, and I suppose, if I can't get at the bishop, the parish priest will do as well. If the whole results in this, I might better relinquish the search after infallibility altogether, and at once use my own sense and judgment, however fallible, and compare the Bull with the Holy Scriptures rather than be left in such a maze of uncertainties, heaped one upon another, with no better guide than a man like myself, admitted to be fallible, and having, perhaps, some interest in deceiving me into the belief of a doctrine on which he, perhaps, depends for his livelihood. I shall be happy, however, to renew our conference on another opportunity; at present accept my thanks for all the trouble you have taken for my enlightenment—farewell.

### THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM.—No. II.

WE have had occasion, in our last volume (see p. 7), to bring before our readers Scriptural proof of the fact that, even in the apostles' days, teachers of error existed, and that even among the clergy of the Church; but that when the apostles warn their converts against the danger of being misled by such false teachers they tell them of no infallible safeguard against it. They say nothing of general councils whose decisions shall be miraculously secured from error; nor of any central church whose guidance may be implicitly followed; nor of any successor of St. Peter who shall supply Christians with unerring directions. Their only advice to their followers is to watch, to take heed to themselves and to the doctrine which had been delivered to them.

Modern Romanists, however, have discovered a commendable way of arriving at truth, a way of which we find no traces in the records of the apostolic age. Their plan is not to judge of the Church by its doctrine, but to judge of the doctrine by the Church which teaches it. And when they find Protestants pursuing the ancient method of testing whether a doctrine be true, by heedful comparison of it with the doctrines which the apostles are recorded to have delivered, they taunt them with the uncertainty of their process. They say, whether such and such a doctrine be true is, after all, but a matter of opinion; but that we are in communion with the successor of St. Peter is a matter of fact.

It is an obvious reply that this matter of fact, as it is called, together with the consequences supposed to follow from it, involves several very doubtful matters of opinion. It is matter of opinion whether St. Peter possessed privileges distinct in kind from those enjoyed by the other apostles, so that he alone of them was to transmit his infallibility to successors; it is matter of opinion whether St. Peter were ever Bishop of Rome; and, since St. Peter is said to have been Bishop of Antioch as well as of Rome, it is matter of opinion whether the Bishop of Rome necessarily exclusively inherits from him the office of infallible guide to the Christian Church.

But it might be supposed that, if all these points could be once comfortably settled, then we should be released from the necessity for all that care and watchfulness which the poor Christians of the apostles' times were obliged to employ—if we only adhere firmly to the doctrines of the Bishop of Rome, we shall, without any further investigation, be sure of being in the right. We are tempted to congratulate ourselves on having so simple a rule for attaining religious truth, and only to wonder how St. Paul should have so inexcusably omitted to have mentioned it to those whom he was cautioning against error.

But, alas, even this simple rule, "to adhere to the Bishop of Rome," has its uncertainties too; for we have first to determine who the real Bishop of Rome is. Now, in all the time between the third century and the Reformation, not a century has passed in which there has not been a schism in the church on this very point, and in which Christians have not been perplexed between the contending claims of different pretenders to the Roman See. We commenced in the last number a history of one of those schisms, commonly counted the 29th (!) of them, but not the last of them. It was, however, the greatest and most memorable of them, both for its duration, its extent, and its damaging effects on the Papal claims. It differs, too, from other schisms in this—that in other cases, but not in this, Roman Catholic divines are now pretty well agreed as to which of the rival claimants had right on their side, and as to which of the parties of their adherents are to be branded as schis-

matics. Even in these cases, however, it is a great mistake to suppose that, because a matter is plain to us now, it was equally plain at the time. Let us suppose that Roman Catholics are right in maintaining, that our Lord cannot possibly have made it necessary for Christians to search for truth by a toilsome investigation through the inspired records of his teaching, but that he must have afforded them a safe, and a shorter way to it; and what are we to think of the case of a man who has endeavoured to adopt this shorter and safer way, who has been only anxious to adhere to the Roman Pontiff, but who has, unfortunately, chosen the wrong one? He may have exerted in his choice of a right Pope as much care and watchfulness as Protestants think it necessary to spend in their choice of the right doctrine; he may have followed the opinion of some of those in whose learning and piety he had the most confidence; he may have had a considerable number of his contemporaries on his side: but, perhaps, some hundred years after his death, it may be discovered that the question which had perplexed him was an easy one; and that, though he had but the one thing to decide—who was the true Pope—he had decided it wrong, and had, in spite of all his care, wandered from the true fold, outside of which there is no salvation.

But the case of the great western schism is peculiar in this, that high Roman Catholic authority can still be produced in support of the claims of each of the rival popes, or at least in support of the opinion, that either of them might have been safely followed. This last is certainly the most charitable opinion, yet we doubt whether a Romanist can adopt it consistently; for the two pretenders could not have been both real popes. Either, therefore, the Christian world was for years without a Pope, or else one of the two was the genuine Pope, and the other was an impostor. Surely, then, it will not be said that it was a matter of indifference which of the two a Christian adhered to. The real reason why Roman Catholics have been so anxious to make out that there was safety on both sides is, that it is not pleasant for them to be obliged to confess that, with all their anxiety to find a rule which shall deliver Christians from all uncertainty, and all possibility of going wrong, their rule was one which set the half of Christendom in a fatal mistake for the space of several years. We shall prove, at all events, from contemporary documents, that the question—which was the true Pope—was one which Christians were at the time held bound to decide rightly, as they valued their everlasting salvation.

You will remember that we told you in the last number how the cardinals first chose Urban as their Pope; how they afterwards gave out that this choice, having been made by compulsion, and in terror for their lives, was invalid; and how they selected Clement as the true Pope.

The following are extracts from a circular issued by the cardinals soon after (see Baluzius Vitæ Pont. Aven. ii. 847):—"To all the faithful in Christ, the cardinals—bishops, priests and deacons—of the Holy Roman Church send greeting in the Lord. Having been appointed watchmen by the Lord God of Hosts, and occupying the highest post next after the Roman Pontiff, we are bound vigilantly to point out to the faithful the dangers which threaten their souls, and the snares and attacks of the enemy. Whereas, therefore, we have learned for certain, that that seducer, Bartholomew, formerly Archbishop of Bari, falsely calling himself Pope, has, as another Antichrist, sent certain false prophets to different parts of the world, whom he alone has constituted cardinals, together with some other defenders of his wickedness, in order that, by false persuasions and crafty suggestions, they may seduce the Christian people, and may cause them, to the eternal damnation of their souls, to adhere to the aforesaid apostate: and whereas, on this account, our most holy lord, Pope Clement VII., has desired us, who have perfect knowledge of this matter, to instruct the faithful concerning it: and whereas it pertains to none others than us, next after our most holy lord, Pope Clement VII., to inform the faithful who is the true Pope, therefore, we beseech you all, in Jesus Christ, for the safety of your souls, to adhere to the same lord, Clement," &c., &c.

Here, you see, it is taught plainly enough, that the adherents of Urban perilled their salvation; and there certainly appears great show of reason in what the cardinals said—viz., That if any doubt should arise as to who the true Pope was, no one could be fitter than the cardinals (who are the next highest authority to the Pope) to decide it; and it is hard to think that any man went fatally wrong who believed him to be the Pope whom the cardinals proclaimed as such.

However, as we do not wish to give you merely one side of the question, we shall give you an abridgment, on the other hand, of Urban's Bull denouncing Clement, which will be found in full in Raynaldus's Continuation of Baronius, An. 1378, p. 41:—"Since lately the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts—that is, the Holy Roman Church—has been compelled to heave deep groans, because the sons of her womb which she had brought up and raised from a lowly station to the highest dignities—viz., those children of iniquity and perdition, Robert, &c. [here the anti-Pope and his cardinals are enumerated]—have attempted to rend the seamless robe of the Lord, and have

not only involved themselves in the bands of sin, but, being given over to a reprobate mind, have endeavoured to draw others with them to destruction; therefore, we who, by the Divine clemency, have the care of the aforesaid vineyard, have deemed it right, in the might of the Most High, to rise up and proceed against them and certain others of their favourers, as follows." Having then enumerated the offences of which Clement and his party had been guilty, in denying the authority of Urban, the latter proceeds:—"Wherefore, being unable, without grievous remorse of conscience, to tolerate any longer such wickedness, we decree that Robert [and Co.] have been and are schismatics, and apostates, and conspirators against us, and blasphemers, and to be punished as heretics; and we excommunicate and anathematize them, and we depose them from their cardinalships, and from all other ecclesiastical dignities, and we declare them incapable of holding any in future, and we deprive [certain of their lay supporters] of all their dignities, and of the order of knighthood; and we confiscate all the goods of the aforesaid condemned persons, both moveable and immovable, and we declare their persons detestable and infamous, and that they ought to be taken by the faithful and kept in close prison and under safe custody until we command further on the subject."

"Further, we excommunicate any person who shall knowingly commit any of the bodies of the aforesaid ecclesiastical sepulture; from which excommunication he shall not be absolved until he have, with his own hand, disinterred and cast out from ecclesiastical burial the bodies of the aforesaid."

"Further, we command every faithful person, of whatever rank—be he king, or queen, or emperor, or of whatever other dignity, even if he be cardinal of the Holy Roman Church—that he do not knowingly receive any of the aforesaid condemned persons into his city, camp, lands, or possessions of any kind; and that he do not carry, or suffer to be carried, to any of the aforesaid condemned, or to the places where they dwell, any grain, wine, flesh, clothes, wood, victuals, money, merchandize, or any goods whatsoever."

"Further, we command all the faithful to assist any persons who may be engaged in capturing any of the aforesaid condemned persons, or in detaining them when captured, or in transmitting them to us; and we excommunicate any private person who shall transgress the aforesaid commands, or who shall knowingly call the aforesaid Robert (styling himself Clement), by the name of Pope; or who shall believe or hold him for a Pope; from which excommunication he shall not be freed by any but the Roman Pontiff, except in the article of death."

Of the remainder of the Bull we shall only mention, that he offers to all those who shall undertake a crusade for the extermination of the aforesaid schismatics, and who shall persecute them to the utmost of their power, the privileges and indulgences granted to those who proceed to the succour of the Holy Land; and that he releases the subjects of the princes who adhere to his rival from their obedience to their monarchs.

Here, then, was a comfortable position for a private Christian to be placed in. On the one hand, Urban excommunicates him if he calls Clement Pope, or holds or believes him to be so; and he releases him from his obedience to his civil magistrate, if the civil power in question take the part of Clement; while, on the other hand, Clement is not backward in similar threats, if he hold Urban for Pope.

Remember that the main argument for the existence of an infallible guide in the church is, that it is inconceivable that God could have left Christians exposed to the risk of error in any matter concerning their eternal salvation; but here we see that the institution of the office of Pope does not preserve Christians from such risk of error; that, on the contrary, Christians were left for several years together perplexed between the claims of two popes, in favour of each of whom so much might be said, and each of whom uttered the most frightful curses against the other and his adherents.

We have just given a mild specimen of a Pope's curse; we shall now enable our readers to judge what it was worth: for you must remember that one of the two parties must have been the real Pope, and that his curses had all the efficacy which papal dignity can give. If any of our readers, then, have the misfortune to be cursed by the priest for reading the Word of God, or any other similar offence, it may be a comfort to him to find that even a Pope's curse is not a very fatal affair.

The Jesuit Maimbourgh writes as follows (History of the Western Schism):—"The thunderbolts and the anathemas which the two popes launched against each other, and against all those who followed the opposite party, did no harm to any body." P. 57.—"The two popes continued to launch against each other, from time to time, a thousand thunderbolts of curses, which caused furious scandal and terrible disorder throughout Christendom. But as they cared little for the thunderbolts which thus missed fire, they soon had recourse to other arms which did much more mischief, producing bloody and fatal effects." p. 78.

Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, who was canonized as a saint, in 1523, writes as follows (vol. iii., p. 390):—"There were among the adherents of either party,